

Serial No. 10/718,642 2
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-34 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicants have not amended the claims by the present response.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-19, 22-32, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bogward (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049743). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogward in view of Zak (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004729). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogward in view of Retter (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,362). Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogward in view of Dardick (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0075317).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention (e.g., as defined by exemplary claim 1) is directed to portable computing device.

The device includes a display, and a touch-sensitive display which is secondary and attachable to the display. The display and the touch-sensitive display display two adjoining display portions of a single display output. Only the touch-sensitive display is touch-sensitive (e.g., see Application at page 8, lines 20-22 and Figure 1).

Serial No. 10/718,642 3
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

II. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Bogward Reference

The Examiner alleges that Bogward teaches the claimed invention of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-19, 22-32, and 34. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Bogward does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Bogward does not teach or suggest, *“a display; and a touch-sensitive display which is secondary and attachable to the display”*, as recited in exemplary claim 1 and somewhat similarly recited in exemplary claims 8, 22-25, and 28.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner alleges that Bogward teaches the claimed display and touch-sensitive display (see Office Action dated May 11, 2009 at page 2). The Examiner does not specifically point out which features of Bogward that she is attempting to analogize to the claimed display and touch-sensitive display. Indeed, the Examiner merely refers to Figures 1, 2, and 18, and paragraphs [0012] and [0190] of Bogward to support her allegations. The Examiner, however, has mischaracterized the teachings of Bogward.

Figures 1, 2, and 18 of Bogward each illustrate a main display part 1010 and a main operator control part 1020. It appears that the Examiner is attempting to analogize the main display part 1010 and the main operator part 1020 to the claimed display and touch sensitive display.

Paragraph [0012] does not describe the main display part 1010 or the main operator part 1020. Paragraph [0190], however, describes the embodiment illustrated in Figure 18.

Specifically, Bogward discloses a main display part 1010 and a main operator control part 1020, which may include a touch pad. The touch pad 1020, however, is not a display. It is merely a touch sensitive control pad.

Serial No. 10/718,642 4
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

In another embodiment, Bogward teaches that the main operator control part 1020 may have an active or passive display functionality, which can be used for displaying characters respectively assigned to key regions (see Bogward at paragraph [0159]).

In stark contrast, however, in the claimed invention the display and the touch-sensitive display display two adjoining display portions of a single display output. In Bogward, the main operator control part 1020 merely displays characters of key regions, and not the output that is displayed on the main display part 1010.

Finally, Applicants remind the Examiner that it is inappropriate to combined features from separate embodiments in a prior art reference without a specific teaching of that particular combination.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Bogward does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. The Secondary References

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Zak with Bogward to teach the claimed invention of claim 20. Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Retter with Bogward to teach the claimed invention of claim 21. Finally, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Dardick with Bogward to teach the claimed invention of claim 33. Applicant submits, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, claims 20, 21, and 33 are allowable at least based on similar reasons to those

Serial No. 10/718,642 5
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

set forth above, in section A, with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-19, 22-32, and 34.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, even if combined, the alleged combinations of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-34, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Serial No. 10/718,642 6
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

Date: August 11, 2009

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254